1956

Accounting for costs of pension plans; Accounting Research Bulletin, no. 47

American Institute of Certified Public Accountants. Committee on Accounting Procedure

Accounting Research BULLETINS

★

Issued by the
Committee on Accounting Procedure
American Institute of Accountants
270 Madison Avenue, New York 16, N. Y.

September, 1956 No. 47

Accounting for Costs of Pension Plans

1. Variations in the provisions of pension plans in the United States, in their financial arrangements, and in the circumstances attendant upon their adoption, have resulted in substantial differences in accounting for pension costs. This bulletin indicates guides which, in the opinion of the committee, are acceptable for dealing with costs of pension plans in the accounts and reports of companies having such plans. It is not concerned with funding as such.

2. The term *pension plan* is here intended to mean a formal arrangement for employee retirement benefits, whether established unilaterally or through negotiation, by which commitments, specific or implied, have been made which can be used as the basis for estimating costs. It does not include profit-sharing plans or deferred-compensation contracts with individuals. It does not apply to informal arrangements by which voluntary payments are made to retired employees, usually in amounts fixed at or about the time of an employee's retirement and in the light of his then situation but subject to change or discontinuance at the employer's will; where such informal arrangements exist, the pay-as-you-go method of accounting for pension costs generally is appropriate, although the accrual method is equally appropriate in cases where costs can be estimated with reasonable accuracy.

3. When a pension plan is first adopted, it is customary to provide that pensions for covered employees will give recognition not only to services which are to be rendered by them in the future, but also to services which have been rendered by them prior to the adoption of the plan. The costs of the pensions to the employer, therefore, usually are based in part on past services and in part on current and future services of the employees. The committee considers that all of such costs are costs of doing business, incurred in contemplation of present and future benefits, as are other employment costs such as wages, salaries, and social security taxes. It, therefore, is of the opinion that past service benefit costs should be charged to operations during the current and future periods benefited, and should not be charged to earned surplus *at the inception of the plan.* The committee believes that, in the case of an *existing plan* under which inadequate charges or no charges for past services have been made thus far and the company has decided to conform its accounting to the preferred procedure expressed in this bulletin, it may be appropriate to charge to earned surplus the amount that should have been accumulated by charges to income since inception of the plan.

4. In addition to the basic features of a pension plan relating to employee eligibility and the level of pension payments, other factors enter into the determination of the ultimate costs of pensions. Some of these are:

(a) other benefits (such as social security) where amounts of pension payments are integrated therewith;

(b) length of life of employees both before and after retirement;

(c) employee turnover;

(d) in some cases, alternatives as to age at which employees may retire;

(e) future compensation levels; and

(f) in a funded plan, future rates of earnings on the fund and the status of fund investments.

Because of these factors, the total cost of the pensions that will be paid ultimately to the present participants in a plan cannot be determined precisely in advance, but, by the use of actuarial techniques, reasonably accurate estimates can be made. There are other business costs for which it is necessary to make periodic provisions in the accounts based upon assumptions and estimates. The committee believes that the uncertainties relating to the determination of pension costs are not so pronounced as to preclude similar treatment.

5. In the view of many, the accrual of costs under a pension plan should not necessarily be dependent on the funding arrangements provided for in the plan or governed by a strict legal interpretation of the obligations under the plan. They feel that because of the widespread adoption of pension plans and their importance as part of compensation structures, a provision for cancellation or the existence of a terminal date for a plan should not be the controlling factor in accounting for pension costs, and that for accounting purposes it is reasonable to assume in most cases that a plan, though modified or renewed (because of terminal dates) from time to time, will continue for an indefinite period. According to this view, costs based on current and future services should be systematically accrued during the expected period of active service of the covered employees, generally upon the basis of actuarial calculations. Such calculations may be made as to each employee, or as to categories of employees (by age, length of service, or rate of pay, for example), or they may be based upon an average of the expected service lives of all covered employees. These calculations, although made primarily for funding purposes, may be used also for accounting purposes. They should, of course, be revised at intervals. Also according to this view, costs based on past services should be charged off over some reasonable period, provided the allocation is made on a systematic and rational basis and does not cause distortion of the operating results in any one year. The length of the period benefited by costs based on past services is subject to considerable difference of opinion. Some think that the benefits accrue principally during the early years of a plan;

others feel that the period primarily benefited approximates the remaining service life of the employees covered by a plan at the time of its adoption; still others believe that the benefits of such costs extend over an indefinite period, possibly the entire life of a plan and its successors, if any. In practice, costs based on past services have in many instances been charged off over a ten- to twelve-year period, or over a fixed longer period such as twenty or thirty years. (The minimum period presently permitted for tax purposes is ten years if the initial past-service cost is immediately paid in full, or about twelve years if one-tenth of the initial past-service cost plus interest is paid each year.)

6. In the view of others, the full accrual of pension costs may be unnecessary. They point out that in some cases accounting for such costs in the manner indicated in paragraph 5 would result, as to a given year or cumulatively or both, in the accrual of costs under a pension plan in amounts differing materially from the payments made under the plan into a pension fund or to retired employees, and in other cases it would require the employer to record pension costs in amounts varying widely from his legal liabilities. They say that a company would in all probability never be called upon to utilize the entire amount of an actuarially calculated full accrual, and that, in the event of liquidation of the business, any amounts accrued with respect to employees who have not at the time acquired vested rights would, except for a voluntary act of grace, revert to the surplus of the company. They also believe that in the case of an unfunded or partially funded plan the accumulation of a substantial accrual would lead to pressure for full funding, possibly to the detriment of the company and its security holders, and that fear of this might deter management from entering into pension arrangements beneficial to employees. They also feel that the method of accounting envisioned in paragraph 5 disregards the probability that future unfavorable changes in a company's economic position undoubtedly would lead to changes in the pension arrangements it would make for its em-

ployees. According to this view, management should have wider discretion in accounting for pension costs, provided there is adequate disclosure as to the method followed.

7. The committee regards the method outlined in paragraph 5 as being the method most likely to effect a reasonable matching of costs and revenues, and therefore considers it to be preferable. However, the committee believes that opinion as to the accounting for pension costs has not yet crystallized sufficiently to make it possible at this time to assure agreement on any one method, and that differences in accounting for pension costs are likely to continue for a time. Accordingly, for the present, the committee believes that, as a minimum, the accounts and financial statements should reflect accruals which equal the present worth, actuarially calculated, of pension commitments to employees to the extent that pension rights have vested in the employees, reduced, in the case of the balance sheet, by any accumulated trusteed funds or annuity contracts purchased.

8. The committee believes that the costs of many pension plans are so material that the fact of adoption of a plan or an important amendment to it constitutes significant information in financial statements. When a plan involving material costs is adopted, there should be a footnote to the financial statements for the year in which this occurs, stating the important features of the plan, the proposed method of funding or paying, the estimated annual charge to operations, and the basis on which such annual charge is determined. When an existing plan is amended to a material extent, there should be similar disclosure of the pertinent features of the amendment. When there is a change in the accounting procedure which materially affects the results of operations, there should be appropriate indication thereof. If there are costs of material amount based on past or current services for which reasonable provision has not been, or is not being, made in the accounts, appropriate disclosure should be made in a footnote to the financial statements as long as this situation exists.

The statement entitled "Accounting for Costs of Pension Plans" was adopted unanimously by the twenty-one members of the committee, of whom six, Messrs. Flatley, Jennings, Lindquist, Luther, Powell and Staub, assented with qualification.

The six members assenting with qualification object to that part of paragraph 3 which appears to sanction the charging to earned surplus in some circumstances of pension costs based on past service. They believe this to be in conflict with section A of chapter 13 of Accounting Research Bulletin No. 43, in which the committee expresses the opinion that costs of annuities based on past service should not be charged to surplus. They consider the conclusions expressed in chapter 13 to be sound for the reasons therein stated.

NOTES

(See Introduction to *Accounting Research Bulletin* No. 43.)

1. Accounting Research Bulletins represent the considered opinion of at least two-thirds of the members of the committee on accounting procedure, reached on a formal vote after examination of the subject matter by the committee and the research department. Except in cases in which formal adoption by the Institute membership has been asked and secured, the authority of the bulletins rests upon the general acceptability of opinions so reached.

2. Opinions of the committee are not intended to be retroactive unless they contain a statement of such intention. They should not be considered applicable to the accounting for transactions arising prior to the publication of the opinions. However, the committee does not wish to discourage the revision of past accounts in an individual case if the accountant thinks it desirable in the circumstances. Opinions of the committee should be considered as applicable only to items which are material and significant in the relative circumstances.

3. It is recognized also that any general rules may be subject to exception; it is felt, however, that the burden of justifying departure *from accepted procedures must be assumed by those who adopt other treatment. Except where there is a specific statement of a different intent by the committee, its opinions and recommendations are directed primarily to business enterprises organized for profit.*

COMMITTEE ON ACCOUNTING PROCEDURE (1955-1956)

JOHN A. LINDQUIST, Chairman
GORDON S. BATTELLE
GARRETT T. BURNS
ROBERT CALDWELL
ALMAND R. COLEMAN
ROBERT L. DIXON
L. T. FLATLEY
THOMAS D. FLYNN

CARL H. FORSBERG
LeVERNE W. GARCIA
DONALD R. JENNINGS
WILLIAM L. KEATING
HOMER L. LUTHER
JOHN K. McCLARE
JOHN PEOPLES
WELDON POWELL

WALTER R. STAUB
ROSS T. WARNER
WILLIAM W. WERNTZ
EDWARD B. WILCOX
JAMES B. WILLING

CARMAN G. BLOUGH
Director of Research